



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/201,749	12/01/1998	PING-WEN ONG	11	1977

7590 11/29/2001

KEVIN M MASON
RYAN & MASON
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/201,749

Applicant(s)

ONG, PING-WEN

Examiner

Ella Colbert

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12 & 13.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22, and 28 have been amended in this communication.
2. Applicant's response of 09/07/01 has been entered as CPA, paper number 11.
3. Applicant's IDS of 09/07/01 has been entered as paper no. 12 and the Supplemental IDS of 10/09/01 has been entered as paper no. 13. Both Information Disclosure Statements have been considered.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingrassia, Jr. et al (US 5,941,957), hereafter Ingrassia.

With respect to claim 1, receiving a request for the electronic document, the request including a time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-38 and lines 57-65) and identifying as a function of the time-stamp a machine storing a version of the electronic document for a time period corresponding to the time-stamp (col. 8, lines 9-22). Ingrassia did not explicitly teach, transmitting the electronic document corresponding to the time-stamp from the identified machine in col. 7, lines 30-65, but it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the electronic document corresponding to the time-stamp from the identified machine and in view of Ingrassia's teachings of the web browser sending requests via a network and the WTS server creating a session for the browser based on a unique ID and issuing a timestamp and storing the URL and timestamp of a web page because such a modification would allow Ingrassia's system to know the time the electronic document was transmitted from the server and stored in a URL history list and a command list created for the session.

With respect to claim 2, an address identifying the document includes the time-stamp (col. 8, lines 6-47).

With respect to claim 3, the address is a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") (col. 8, lines 6-22 and fig. 6).

With respect to claim 4, the Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") has an associated request header for indicating said stamp (col. 9, lines 1-27).

With respect to claim 5, Ingrassia did not explicitly teach, transmitting the version of said electronic document with the most recent time-stamp preceding the requested time-stamp if a version of the electronic document does not exist with the requested time-stamp in col. 8, line 48-67 and col. 9, line 1-27, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the version of the electronic document with the most recent time-stamp preceding the requested time-stamp if a version of the electronic document does not exist with the requested time-stamp because such a modification in Ingrassia would allow Ingrassia's

system to know when the time-stamp was issued, received, and the URL stored into the session (a session is defined as a collection of web page interactions that occur over a given period of time).

With respect to claim 6, the request is specified using a browser (col. 7, lines 11-15 and lines 30-65).

With respect to claim 7, the time-stamp is a relative time-stamp (col. 7, lines 57-65).

With respect to claim 8, a memory (col. 4, line 51, col. 7, lines 45-49 and col. 8, lines 28-30 and lines 56-58) and a processor (col. 4, line 48-51).

Independent claim 8 is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

With respect to claim 9 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 9.

With respect to claim 10 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3.

With respect claim 11 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

With respect to claim 12 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 13 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 5.

With respect to claim 14 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 15 , Ingrassia teaches, a computer readable medium having computer readable program code means, the computer readable program code means comprising program code means (col. 4, line 52 and col. 7, lines 19-29);

This independent claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

With respect to claim 16, receiving a request for the electronic document associated with the domain name, the electronic document having multiple versions, each of the versions being identified by a time-stamp indicating a creation time of the corresponding version, the request including a time-stamp in col. 7, lines 30-65; identifying as a function of said time-stamp, a machine corresponding to a version of the domain name for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 8, lines 9-22) and transmitting an indication of the identified machine storing the electronic document corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 8, lines 22-44). Ingrassia did not explicitly teach, a domain name, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate an electronic document with a domain name and to modify in Ingrassia because such a modification would allow Ingrassia's system to have an address of a network connection that would identify the owner of the address in a hierarchical format which is well known in the art of the Internet.

With respect to claim 17 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

With respect to claim 18 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3

With respect claim 19 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

With respect to claim 20 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 21 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 22, a memory (col. 4, line 51-52) for storing a database identifying a machine storing an electronic document (col. 4, lines 44-48) corresponding to said domain name for a plurality of time periods (col. 8, lines 28-30 and lines 56-58, and col. 16, lines 22-52); a processor (col. 4, line 48-51) operatively coupled to said memory (col. 4, line 51-52) configured to receive a request for an electronic document associated with the domain name (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52), said electronic document having multiple versions, each of said versions being identified by a time-stamp (col. 7, lines 49-62); the request including a time-stamp (col. 7, lines 52-62); access the database as a function of said time-stamp to identify a machine corresponding to a version of said domain name for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 7, lines 16-18 and col. 8, lines 34-44); and transmit an indication of the identified machine storing electronic document corresponding to the time-stamp (col. 8, lines 11-19). Ingrassia did not explicitly teach, a domain name, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate an electronic document with a domain name and to modify in Ingrassia because such a modification would allow Ingrassia's system to have an address of a

network connection that would identify the owner of the address in a hierarchical format which is well known in the art of the Internet.

With respect to claim 23 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

With respect to claim 24 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3.

With respect to claim 25 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

With respect to claim 26 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 27 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 28 this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 15.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Shen et al (US 5,596,746) teaches a database schema with an object model and HTML documents.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on **Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm.**

Art Unit: 2172

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7240 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 or 703-746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



E. Colbert

November 15, 2001



HOSAIN T. ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER